R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 880 SP 001 072

THE EARNING POWER OF TEACHERS, A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE 50 LARGEST CITIES AND SELECTED SUBURBS ENROLLING 6,000 PUPILS OR MORE.

BY- BURTON, DONALD
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, CHICAGO, ILL.

PUB DATE FEB 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.28 57P.

DESCRIPTORS- ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *BEGINNING TEACHERS, ECONOMIC FACTORS, *LIVING STANDARDS, TABLES (DATA), *TEACHER DISTRIBUTION, *TEACHER EMPLOYMENT, TEACHER MOTIVATION, *TEACHER SALARIES, CHICAGO

THIS COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS INVESTIGATED MOONLIGHTING, MINIMUM ADEQUATE FAMILY INCOME, TEACHERS' SALARIES AS AGAINST THOSE IN OTHER OCCUPATIONS, AND POTENTIAL EARNING POWER. THE AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME OF ALL TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES DURING 1966-67 WAS $6,820, BELOW THAT OF MOST INDUSTRIAL, TECHNICAL, AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES. IN THE 50 LARGEST CITIES IT WAS $8,024, WITH SAN FRANCISCO ($10,033), LOS ANGELES ($9,078), AND NEW YORK ($8,900) LEADING THE OTHERS. HOWEVER, A COMPARISON OF THESE SALARIES WITH THE MINIMUM INCOME NEEDED BY FAMILIES SHOWED ONLY A SMALL SURPLUS. THUS, THE HIGH INCIDENCE OF MOONLIGHTING AMONG TEACHERS CAN BE ATTRIBUTED TO A DESIRE FOR FINANCIAL SECURITY AND EARNINGS COMPARABLE TO THOSE WITH THE SAME OR EVEN LESS EDUCATION. STATISTICS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS AND A DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF THE TEACHER POPULATIONS IN THE VARIOUS SCHOOL SYSTEMS (EXPERIENCE, AVERAGE SALARY, PERCENT AT MAXIUMUM SALARY, SUBSTITUTES) ARE ALSO PROVIDED. THIS PUBLICATION IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, 716 NORTH RUSH STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611, FOR $1.00. (LC)

01072

ED011880

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

APR 25 1967

A1

1966/67

THE EARNING POWER OF TEACHERS

SP001072

A comparative analysis of the economic factors affecting teachers in the school systems of the 50 largest citie. and selected suburbs enrolling 6,000 pupils or more.

1966/67

THE EARNING POWER OF TEACHERS

A comparative analysis of the economic factors affecting teachers in the school systems of the 50 largest cities and selected suburbs enrolling 6,000 pupils or more.

Donald Burton
AFT Researcher

Published February, 1967, by the
American Federation of Teachers
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I PAGE
Introduction 1
Teachers and Moonlighting 3
Necessary Income for Families 7
Comparison Between Teachers' Salaries and Those in Other Occupations 11
Average Salaries of Teachers 13
Earning Power of Teachers 17

PART II PAGE
Major Cities and Their Suburbs:
Introduction 25
Placement of New Teachers 27
Placement of All Teachers 29
Average Salaries 31
Credit for Prior Teaching Experience 33
Teachers at Maximum 35
Long-Term Substitutes 35
Individual Data on the 15 Largest Cities and Their Suburbs 40
Individual Data on the 50 Largest Cities 51

INTRODUCTION

For over 50 years the American Federation of Teachers [AFT] has tried to improve the status and welfare of the classroom teacher. No other organization can legitimately make this claim for this class of professionals. Nevertheless, we in the AFT will remain dissatisfied until we have succeeded in elevating the classroom teacher to his proper rank in the professional realm. We are somewhat akin to Avis—we keep on trying.

Few--including superintendents and board of education members—begrudge our continuous effort to produce study after study on behalf of the classroom teacher. One reason is that teachers must renew their bargaining efforts each year in order to climb another rung on the economic ladder. (In reality, teachers barely maintain their same relative status to most other employees.) In a sense, this process represents collective begging. Most other professionals do not have to worry about an annual journey to the negotiating table. Teachers have that one distinction over other professionals. The purpose of this study is to provide classroom teachers with data that will assist them to make meaningful presentations to their employers during negotiations.

The study is divided into two major parts. Part one examines the relative earning power of classroom teachers in the United States. Part two results from an AFT survey and is concerned with the relationship of teacher salaries in the big cities as it compares to teacher salaries in selected suburbs. The introduction to part two (page 25) describes the methodology and the scope of the study for that section.

For the hundreds of superintendents, directors of personnel, directors of research, AFT members and others who have provided us with our basic data, we are deeply appreciative. If they were not interested in bringing dignity to the education profession, we know that they would not respond to our requests. Perhaps this study will contribute in some measure to the cooperative spirit of all those in the educational enterprise, and that someday teachers will enjoy the true professional status they are seeking.

MOONLIGHTING BY TEACHERS

One argument used, by school board members and other interested citizens, to illustrate that teachers earn enough money for their services is that teachers only work nine or 10 months each year and have numerous days off during that period. Clearly, teachers do teach an average of only 190 days each year.

The most frequent rebuttals are: that teachers are required to be on duty many additional days during which students are not present, that lesson planning and the grading of papers consumes an enormous number of "off duty" hours, that teachers are expected or required to attend many functions or meetings at night and, that the euphemistic "vacation" is really a sanity leave. Although these are the most frequent rebuttals, there are others.

Thousands of school districts still *require* that teachers earn a prescribed number of course credits during limited periods of time in order to qualify for a salary raise. Teachers do not earn these credits during school hours. How many employers in other professions impose such demands upon their employees?

How often are teachers allowed to travel or attend conferences within their realm of expertise? Rarely, if ever, and then at their own expense—and frequently on their own time.

Then there are thousands of teachers who teach such subjects as geography, anthropology, American or ancient history, American or English literature, art, agriculture, physical education, biology, etc., who are compelled by their own dedication to expand their fields of knowledge by traveling throughout the United States

or even the world. This is usually done at the teacher's expense and on his time, with the exception of those teachers on sabbatical leave, who generally receive half pay or the difference between their pay and the pay of their substitute.

For many teachers, each day away from school allows an opportunity for needed relaxation and recuperation. It is not easy to face 175-200 students each day and be pleasant and stimulating without some occasional rest. The problem of maintaining mental and physical health is crucial for many teachers—just observe the slouched bodies in the teachers' lounge some Friday after school lets out.

Despite all this, teachers have consistently had the highest rate of moonlighting!

According to a study conducted by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics[1] in May, 1965, those men whose primary job is teaching have consistently had the highest rate of multiple jobholding. One of every five male teachers, that is 20 percent, has a second job. The national rate of multiple jobholding for all employed workers, however, remains fairly stable at about 5 percent.

This study was conducted during one week of May and included only those male teachers who were working for other employers during that week. The authors gave the following explanation:

The tendency of teachers to take a second job can be partially explained in terms of their skills and their comparatively flexible work schedules. But it is evident that this is not the whole story. Other

[1]Forrest A. Bogan, and Thomas E. Swanstrom, "Multiple Jobholders" in May, 1965, *"Monthly Labor Review,"* Vol. 89, No. 2, February, 1966.

professional and technical workers also have useful skills and often have flexible work schedules, yet their multiple jobholding rate (8 percent) is only two-fifths that of teachers. This suggests that another factor—income—may be a more important determinant. Among male professional workers employed at year-round full-time jobs during 1964, elementary and secondary schoolteachers had lower average earnings for the year than any of the other professional groups.

The authors provide the following chart to illustrate the latter point.

Men Employed Full-Time, Year Around	Median Earnings in 1964
All professional, technical and kindred workers	$ 8,543
Self-employed	13,257
Self-employed medical and other health workers	14,308
Other self-employed professional and technical workers	11,637
All salaried workers	8,262
Salaried technical engineers	10,467
Other salaried workers besides teachers, engineers, and health workers	7,746
Elementary and secondary schoolteachers	6,677[2]

[2]Note that the average salary of all men *and women* teachers during 1964-65 was only $6,220 *(Digest of Educational Statistics,* U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965, p. 37).

A second factor that must bear some responsibility for teachers holding second jobs was given by the same authors:

Another indication that utilization of existing professional skills is not necessarily a factor in taking second jobs is that only one-third of the moonlighting teachers, but over half of the moonlighters in other professions, worked as professionals on their second jobs. Teachers may take second jobs in order to reduce the disparity between their incomes and those of other professionals.

In another study[3], undertaken by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Illinois, a sample of 1,472 teachers was selected at random from nine school systems in the Indianapolis area. Each was sent a questionnaire. The response indicated that 29 percent of the male teachers had worked for other employers outside the school system and another 16 percent had earned income by self-employment. More than three out of 10 who had children were employed by someone in addition to the school system and the rate of self-employment ranged from 13 percent to 25 percent. Summer employment of schoolteachers and non-contractual "after hours" work were not considered to be moonlighting in this study.

If all the teachers were included who taught or coached after school, in the evening, or on Saturdays in their own school systems, plus those teachers employed during the summer, it might well be that three out of every four male teachers choose, or are forced, to supplement their basic salary. No other class of workers can match this unbelievable record.

Thus, for those who maintain that teachers have it easy and only work half a year, the record should be clear. The dignity and prestige of a professional teacher has never been enhanced by his income, at least not that income provided by his primary employer.

[3]Harold W. Guthrie, "Who Moonlights and Why," *Illinois Business Review*, March, 1965, pp. 6-8.

NECESSARY INCOME FOR FAMILIES

The average teacher's salary in the United States is $6,820 (see page 14). The average salary for teachers in the 50 largest cities is $8,024 (see page 53). Both of these figures represent current salaries for the 1966-1967 school year. How do these salaries compare with the income required to raise a family?

The AFL-CIO recently updated the U. S. Department of Labor's "City Worker's Family Budget" of 1959 to determine a "modest but adequate" income needed by families living in America's cities as of June, 1966[1]. It was established that a city worker would need $6,797 to maintain a modest standard of living for his family.

Explanation of Budget

The budget figure of $6,797 was based upon certain criteria which should be described in order for the reader to fully understand why this budget is considered minimal for a family living in a large city.

The U. S. Department of Labor assumed that a family of four (an employed husband, age 38, a wife, not employed outside the home, and two school-age children, a boy, age 13, and a girl, age 8) lived in a rented house or apartment with five rooms.

As one can see, some of the other budget allowances are not lavish:

- for the husband, one suit every two years
- for the wife, 3½ new dresses (one a house dress) a year
- vacuum cleaner every 14 years
- toaster every 12 years
- sewing machine every 20 years
- television set every nine years
- less than one egg per person per day

With an annual income of $6,797, a city worker could not afford a new car, but he could purchase a used car every three years. (An annual allowance of $696 was made for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of an automobile.) It was assumed that 74 percent of the families owned cars except in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, where ownership was assumed for only half the families. *Other than life insurance, this budget does not allow for any luxuries or savings.*

The following chart shows what constitutes the major expenditures for families in 20 of the largest cities:

[1]Ralph D. Scott, "The Income Needs of the City Worker's Family," *American Federationist*, October, 1966, Vol. 73, No. 10, pp. 16-19.

MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE CITY WORKER'S FAMILY BUDGET[1]

JUNE, 1966

City	Food	Housing[2]	Clothing	Medical
U. S. Average[3]	$2,005	$1,512	$604	$400
Atlanta	1,706	1,502	580	316
Baltimore	1,775	1,360	616	365
Boston[4]	2,134	1,720	591	392
Chicago	1,986	1,732	602	395
Cincinnati	1,940	1,507	583	335
Cleveland[5]	1,887	1,496	643	432
Detroit	1,979	1,368	610	458
Houston[4]	1,719	1,250	540	356
Kansas City	1,920	1,478	621	379
Los Angeles	1,925	1,656	582	487
Minneapolis[4]	1,836	1,502	623	465
New York	2,092	1,414	607	343
Philadelphia	2,049	1,302	602	384
Pittsburgh[4]	$2,119	$1,381	$624	$388
Portland, Ore.[4]	1,990	1,507	622	396
St. Louis	1,992	1,639	584	356
San Francisco	2,010	1,546	633	490
Scranton[5]	1,981	1,186	613	322
Seattle[5]	2,084	1,708	623	428
Washington, D. C.[5]	1,925	1,627	613	392

[1]Does not include the following components of the budget—transportation, other goods and services, taxes or federal old age and survivors' insurance.
[2]Includes rent and utilities.
[3]Average for the 20 cities listed; calculated by AFL-CIO on basis of each city's "SMSA" population.
[4]Budget components for April, 1966, due to lack of June, 1966, data.
[5]Budget components for May, 1966, due to lack of June, 1966, data.

The next chart allows a comparison of the average annual salary of teachers with the *minimum* income needed by families living in the same 20 selected cities.

MINIMUM INCOME NEEDED FOR "MODEST BUT ADEQUATE" STANDARD OF LIVING[1]

20 Major Cities—June, 1966

City	Necessary Annual Income	Average Annual Income of Teachers
U. S. Average[3]	$6,797	$7,725[2]
Atlanta	6,161	6,383
Baltimore	6,307	7,562
Boston[4]	7,209	7,750
Chicago	7,063	8,290
Cincinnati	6,608	7,056
Cleveland[5]	6,687	7,000
Detroit[5]	6,629	8,296
Houston[4]	5,851	6,109
Kansas City	6,787	6,084
Los Angeles	6,985	9,078
Minneapolis[4]	6,751	7,855
New York	6,711	8,900 (est.)
Philadelphia	6,525	8,420
Pittsburgh[4]	6,811	7,850

City	Necessary Annual Income	Average Annual Income of Teachers
Portland, Ore.[4]	6,992	7,616
St. Louis	6,980	7,500
San Francisco	7,041	10,033
Scranton[5]	6,379	6,900
Seattle[5]	7,255	7,997
Washington, D. C.[5]	6,874	7,820

[1]For worker with wife and two children, "modest but adequate" as defined in the *Monthly Labor Review* article entitled, "The Interim City Worker's Family Budget," August, 1960; pp. 785-808, U.S. Department of Labor.
[2]Average teacher's salary during 1966-1967 for the above 20 cities only (unweighted).
[3]Average for the 20 cities listed; calculated by the AFL-CIO on basis of each city's "SMSA" population.
[4]Budget for April, 1966, due to lack of June, 1966, data.
[5]Budget for May, 1966, due to lack of June, 1966, data.

It should be obvious that thousands of teachers earn considerably less than this minimum annual income. Even in San Francisco, which is by far the best-paying large school system in the country, there are 290 teachers earning less than the suggested minimum of $7,041 for that city. Fortunately, these teachers do not spend more than two years at this salary.

The stultifying conclusion is that, considering all teachers in the United States, the average salary can barely meet expenses. (Note that since June, 1966, the cost of living has risen sharply.) For teachers in the large cities, the average salary allows for just a few hundred dollars in savings. Part of that "extra" goes for taxes.

Is it any wonder that teachers are becoming more militant?

COMPARISON BETWEEN TEACHERS' SALARIES AND THOSE IN OTHER OCCUPATIONS

The average salary of the classroom teacher increases at a snail-like pace from year to year despite the myth that teachers are finally being fully recognized as genuine professionals. To eke out a $300 increase in salary for teachers is truly a herculean task, and usually requires months of planning, weeks of negotiations, and often requires picketing and threats of a strike or an actual strike (or some other synonymous term).

During the 1966-1967 school year, the average annual salary for classroom teachers was $6,820. This is an increase of $320 over 1965-1966, which is a phenomenal increase when compared to prior years. For the two years before 1965-1966, the average increases were $280 (from 1964-1965 to 1965-1966) and $257 (from 1963-1964 to 1964-1965). In order for teachers' salaries to compare favorably with salaries of other professionals, all teachers would have to receive an immediate $5,000 salary increase. That would put teachers on a par with other professionals in private industry, but *not* with self-employed professionals who would average much higher.

This $5,000 increase in salary for teachers is not unrealistic. The cost would be less than $10 billion annually, which would mean that total expenditures for education would then represent just over 8 percent of the Gross National Product for 1965.[1] There is no reason why expenditures for education should not be *10 percent* of the Gross National Product, or even higher. During 1966-1967, the federal government contributed only 12.5 percent of the expenditures for all educational institutions,

and only 8.1 percent of all the expenditures for the public elementary and secondary schools.[2]

Even if such a proposal were adopted, it, of course, can never compensate teachers for the past years of substandard salary. (If teachers were allowed to vote on the proposal, however, it would probably carry.)

An examination of salaries and wages earned in other occupations reveals that teachers still earn less than construction workers and freight rate clerks, but earn a little more than miners. Even the average annual salary of teachers in the 50 largest cities is just a little higher than the average annual wages of a construction worker.

[1]See Table 24, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1966, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, p. 18.
[2]*Op. cit.*, Table 22, p. 17.

Average Annual Earnings of Selected Industrial, Technical, and Professional Employees in the United States, Ranked by Amount, 1966-1967

Occupational Class	Average Annual Earnings
Attorneys[3]	$14,751
Engineers[3]	12,022
Chemists[3]	11,535
Buyers[3]	8,988
Accountants[3] (excluding auditors and chief accountants)	8,965
Teachers (50 largest cities)[5]	8,024
Construction workers[4]	7,525
Engineering technicians[3]	7,340
Draftsmen[3]	6,945
Freight rate clerks[3]	6,868
All teachers[6]	6,820
Miners[4]	6,743
Manufacturing workers[4]	5,818

[3]U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay, February-March, 1966*, Bulletin No. 1535, October, 1966, Table I, pp. 18-19 (in private industry excluding the states of Hawaii and Alaska).
[4]"Earnings and Hours", Table C-1, *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 89, No. 12, December, 1966, pp. 1429-1430 (for the period December, 1965, through November, 1966).
[5]Computed from AFT survey (includes 42 of the 50 largest cities).
[6]United States Office of Education press release, Jan. 29, 1967.

AVERAGE SALARIES FOR TEACHERS

The average salary for teachers in the United States for the 1966-1967 school year is estimated by the United States Office of Education to be $6,820. (A state by state listing follows.) This represents an increase of $320 from the 1965-1966 school year.

In a study of the average salaries of teachers in the 50 largest cities, conducted by the American Federation of Teachers, 42 of the 50 had a weighted[1] average salary of $8,024. Excluding the city of Dallas (which did not respond) the weighted average salary for the 15 largest cities is $8,360.

There are also significant variations in teachers' salaries among states and regions in the United States. Teachers in the North Atlantic region average $1,570 more than teachers in the Southeast. The extreme example among states shows California with an average of $8,450 and Mississippi at $4,650. The regional and state averages are as follows:

[1]The number of classroom teachers in each school system was multiplied by the average teacher's salary in each school system, totalled, and divided by the total number of teachers.

ESTIMATED AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS,

BY STATE : 1966-1967[2]

UNITED STATES	$6,820
NORTH ATLANTIC	7,360
Connecticut	7,460
Delaware	7,400
Maine	5,850
Maryland	7,308
Massachusetts	7,315
New Hampshire	6,050
New Jersey	7,356
New York	7,900
Pennsylvania	6,815
Rhode Island	6,625
Vermont	5,700
District of Columbia	7,800

GREAT LAKES & PLAINS	$6,770
Illinois	7,400
Indiana	7,377
Iowa	6,250
Kansas	6,100
Michigan	7,300
Minnesota	7,084
Missouri	5,875
Nebraska	5,619
North Dakota	5,280
Ohio	6,534
South Dakota	4,800
Wisconsin	6,700

continued

[2]United States Office of Education press release, Jan. 29, 1967.

SOUTHEAST	$5,790
Alabama	5,480
Arkansas	5,091
Florida	6,430
Georgia	5,895
Kentucky	5,600
Louisiana	6,388
Mississippi	4,650
North Carolina	5,604
South Carolina	5,300
Tennessee	5,650
Virginia	6,400
West Virginia	5,445

WEST AND SOUTHWEST	$ 7,230
Alaska	8,923
Arizona	7,230
California	8,450
Colorado	6,625
Hawaii	7,734
Idaho	5,875
Montana	6,000
Nevada	7,390
New Mexico	6,630
Oklahoma	6,000
Oregon	7,000
Texas	6,025
Utah	6,490
Washington	7,330
Wyoming	6,355

So the appalling disparity in teachers' salaries among the various states continues. Economists in education have long argued the need for equalization among school districts within each state and among states. In fact, one major reason for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was to provide funds to compensate school districts for enriching the education of the disadvantaged. The wealthier school districts could have afforded this without increased federal funds, especially since these school districts had significantly fewer numbers of deprived children. It follows that Title I is a palatable concoction for alleviating the financial and educational crisis of the poorer school districts.

It is true that a great share of these federal funds has been spent for teachers' salaries, but the additional income for teachers has been for additional services rendered, e.g., in special day or after-school programs, basic salary has not been affected except to hire new teachers for these federal programs.

It should be argued, therefore, that the federal government has assumed the responsibility for raising per pupil expenditures but has neglected a concomitant responsibility for raising teachers' salaries. (See page 11 for an AFT proposal to raise teachers' salaries.)

EARNING POWER OF TEACHERS

Teachers who plan to spend their careers in the classroom should be cognizant of their potential earning power. This applies to those preparing for teaching, also. Unfortunately, by the time most teachers find out how much more they could be earning in another school system it is too late. They are married, buying a home, and developing roots in the community. Furthermore, most school systems only allow up to five or six years' credit for teaching experience when placing new teachers on their salary schedules. The logical time to inform a teacher of his potential earning power is while he is still in college.

Suppose a college senior consults with the placement director of his college on the merits of teaching in various areas throughout the United States. The placement director says:

"Young man, if you like a warm climate you can choose, for example, between San Francisco and Tampa."

"Well, sir, how much can I earn say, over 30 years in these school systems?"

"If you teach five years with a bachelor's degree, five years with a master's degree and twenty years with a master's degree plus 30 hours," replies the placement director, "you can earn, at present salaries, $127,667 more by teaching in San Francisco rather than in Tampa."

The college senior, having a questioning mind (as all of them are supposed to have by then) asks,

"Yes, but the cost of living in San Francisco is higher than in Tampa, isn't it?"

"It is higher," replies the placement director. "The minimum annual income needed by a family in San

Francisco is $7,041 according to the Department of Labor. I have no figures for Tampa, but Atlanta is close and the minimum annual income needed there is $6,191. Multiply the difference of $850 times 30 years and you can see that it will cost you $25,500 more to live in San Francisco. That leaves you a balance of $102,167."

Gleefully the college senior exclaims, "Gosh, that means I can buy a new Chevy every year and roll the old one into the bay!"

Most college seniors are single and thus have wide freedom in making choices concerning their future. How many of them would be more selective if they knew these fundamental statistics? Granted, in the example just given there are many variables that would enter into a decision to choose one school system over another. Unfortunately, there is not room enough here to discuss all of the factors that would influence a choice of teaching positions. These variables, however, need to be researched and made available to all prospective and practicing teachers.

The comparison of earnings over a 30-year period is at least one technique for measuring the attractiveness of a school system. This author was curious as to how the salaries varied in the 50 largest cities over a span of 30 years. It was assumed, for the sake of calculation, that each teacher would teach five years on the bachelor's lane, five years on the master's lane, and 20 years on the master's-plus-30-hours lane or their equivalents. This formula was employed because it is more realistic than using a single lane for computation.

The following tabulation shows the school systems in the 50 largest cities and provides two figures for each system: (1) the top figure in brackets represents the *annual* salary that a teacher would be earning after 5, 10, 15, 20, and 30 years; (2) the bottom figure represents the *accumulated* earnings for the same period of years. For easy comparison, the school systems are ranked by total accumulated earnings.

Note how the deployment of increments and steps throughout the various salary schedules creates a difference in total earning power. One example is the comparison of Minneapolis to Washington, D.C.:

Lane	Washington, D.C.[1]	Minneapolis[2]
Bachelor's Minimum	$ 5,840	$ 5,400
Bachelor's Maximum	10,185	9,200
Master's Minimum	6,385	5,900
Master's Maximum	10,730	10,400

A first glance would indicate that Washington, D.C., pays better salaries than Minneapolis. Using the formula explained above, a teacher would earn $3,750 more in Minneapolis during a 30-year period. The difference is in the amount of the increments and where they are placed in the salary schedule, plus the number of years to reach maximum salary. The increments in Minneapolis are larger and the number of years to reach maximum is 12. To reach the maximum at the master's-degree-plus-30-hours level in Washington, D.C., requires 18 years, which includes two longevity steps.

[1]These figures represent the new Washington, D.C., salary schedule signed into law Nov. 13, 1966.

[2]The figures listed for Minneapolis are taken from Survey of Teachers' Salaries, September, 1966, American Federation of Teachers.

CURRENT SALARY AND ACCUMULATED EARNINGS (Beginning 1966-1967 School Year[1])

RANKED BY ACCUMULATED TOTAL

Note: Figures in brackets represent current salaries at completion of 5, 10, 15, 20, and 30 years of teaching. Bottom figures represent accumulated earnings for same periods.

CITY	YEARS OF TEACHING				
	5	10	15	20	30
1) San Francisco	$ (7,605) 34,925	$ (10,690)[2] 84,390	$ (12,100) 144,460	$ (12,100) 204,960	$ (12,100) 325,960
2) Newark	(7,900) 35,500	(10,300) 83,000	(11,500) 140,100	(11,500) 197,600	(12,300) 318,600
3) New York	(6,800) 30,500	(10,050) 77,250	(11,950) 134,900	(11,950) 194,650	(11,950) 314,150
4) San Diego	(6,902) 31,956	(9,341) 75,546	(12,105) 132,289	(12,105) 192,814	(12,105) 313,864
5) Long Beach	(7,330) 33,350	(9,760) 78,850	(11,800) 134,550	(11,800) 193,550	(11,800) 311,550
6) Chicago	(7,400) 33,500	(9,550) 77,750	(10,800) 130,700	(11,050) 185,950	(11,550) 300,200
7) Rochester	(7,070) 31,635	(9,290) 74,670	(11,170) 127,735	(11,400) 183,815	(11,685) 299,525

CITY	YEARS OF TEACHING				
	5	10	15	20	30
8) Oakland	$(7,050) 32,130	$(9,339) 75,525	$(11,217) 130,548	$(11,217) 186,633	$(11,217) 298,803
9) Los Angeles	(7,210) 33,540	(9,610) 78,230	(10,850) 132,480	(10,850) 186,730	(10,850) 295,230
10) Detroit	(7,300) 32,500	(9,600) 76,600	(10,700) 129,700	(10,700) 183,200	(10,700) 290,200
11) Minneapolis	(6,350) 29,000	(8,925) 69,450	(10,900) 122,450	(10,900) 176,950	(10,900) 285,950
12) Washington, D.C.	(6,895) 31,845	(8,740) 72,945	(9,740) 120,865	(10,960) 172,600	(10,960) 282,200
13) Philadelphia	(7,550) 33,490	(9,550) 77,690	(10,200) 128,690	(10,200) 179,690	(10,200) 281,690
14) Phoenix	(6,914) 30,815	(9,131) 72,776	(10,422) 123,232	(10,422) 175,342	(10,422) 279,562
15) Cleveland	(6,950) 31,850	(8,850) 73,000	(10,350) 121,250	(10,350) 173,000	(10,650) 278,000
16) Baltimore	(6,400) 29,500	(8,300) 68,050	(10,300) 116,550	(10,600) 169,550	(10,600) 275,550
17) Denver	(6,200) 28,600	(8,725) 68,525	(10,040) 117,720	(10,390) 168,970	(10,390) 272,870
18) Boston	(6,700) 30,500	(9,100) 71,700	(10,050) 121,950	(10,050) 172,200	(10,050) 272,700
19) Buffalo	(6,600) 30,250	(8,475) 69,875	(10,075) 117,800	(10,275) 168,375	(10,475) 272,325
20) Indianapolis	(6,350) 29,400	(8,350) 68,550	(9,700) 114,500	(10,200) 165,300	(10,700) 272,300

CITY	YEARS OF TEACHING				
	5	10	15	20	30
21) Milwaukee	$ (6,902) 31,630	$ (8,671) 71,995	$ (10,029) 120,946	$ (10,029) 171,091	$ (10,029) 271,381
22) Pittsburgh	(7,100) 31,300	(9,200) 73,400	(9,800) 122,400	(9,800) 171,400	(10,100) 270,900
23) Cincinnati	(6,880) 31,160	(8,880) 72,560	(9,780) 120,560	(10,030) 170,210	(10,030) 270,510
24) Miami[4]	(6,678) 29,044	(8,904) 70,172	(10,017) 119,621	(10,017) 169,706	(10,017) 269,876
25) Seattle	(6,170) 28,750	(8,225) 67,575	(10,160) 116,815	(10,160) 167,615	(10,160) 269,215
26) Jersey City	(6,900) 31,500	(8,700) 72,000	(9,800) 120,300	(9,800) 169,300	(9,800) 267,300
27) Honolulu[3]	(6,480) 29,455	(8,684) 69,662	(9,118) 114,384	(10,053) 163,212	(10,053) 263,742
28) Atlanta	(6,080) 28,050	(8,040) 65,800	(10,000) 112,370	(10,000) 162,370	(10,000) 262,370
29) Dayton	(6,564) 30,420	(8,312) 69,420	(9,592) 114,820	(9,592) 162,780	(9,592) 258,700
30) Omaha	(6,148) 28,620	(8,003) 65,985	(9,858) 112,625	(9,858) 161,915	(9,858) 260,495
31) St. Louis	(6,480) 29,700	(8,100) 67,500	(9,450) 113,130	(9,450) 160,380	(9,450) 254,880
32) New Orleans	(6,400) 29,000	(8,200) 67,000	(9,400) 113,100	(9,400) 160,100	(9,400) 254,100
33) Akron	(6,500) 30,100	(8,225) 68,325	(9,375) 113,100	(9,375) 159,945	(9,375) 253,695

CITY	YEARS OF TEACHING				
	5	10	15	20	30
34) Toledo	$ (6,300) 29,500	$ (7,900) 66,600	$ (9,400) 112,400	$ (9,400) 159,400	$ (9,400) 253,400
35) Portland	(6,250) 28,900	(7,750) 65,100	(9,000) 107,600	(9,275) 153,975	(9,275) 246,725
36) Louisville	(5,916) 27,540	(7,344) 62,220	(8,772) 104,040	(8,976) 148,920	(8,976) 238,680
37) Tulsa	(5,800) 27,000	(7,200) 61,000	(8,600) 102,000	(9,000) 147,000	(9,000) 237,000
38) Columbus	(6,000) 28,000	(7,700) 64,500	(8,300) 105,800	(8,500) 148,300	(8,700) 235,300
39) Kansas City	(5,800) 27,350	(7,300) 61,850	(8,500) 102,350	(8,500) 144,850	(8,700) 231,350
40) St. Paul	(6,400) 29,150	(7,512) 63,878	(8,052) 104,138	(8,052) 144,398	(8,052) 224,918
41) Norfolk	(5,664) 26,064	(7,512) 60,792	(8,052) 101,052	(8,052) 141,312	(8,052) 221,832
42) Memphis	(5,550) 26,100	(6,650) 57,650	(7,900) 95,150	(8,300) 136,650	(8,400) 220,650
43) Birmingham	(5,535) 26,289	(7,272) 60,669	(7,776) 99,549	(7,776) 138,429	(7,776) 216,189
44) Dallas	(5,700) 27,000	(6,850) 59,250	(7,900) 96,650	(7,900) 136,150	(7,900) 215,150
45) Fort Worth	(5,630) 26,990	(6,555) 58,415	(7,680) 95,315	(7,890) 134,765	(7,890) 213,665
46) Houston	(5,390) 24,950	(6,671) 56,305	(7,577) 92,284	(7,800) 131,261	(7,800) 209,261

CITY	YEARS OF TEACHING				
	5	10	15	20	30
47) El Paso	$ (5,500) 26,200	$ (6,300) 56,700	$ (7,100) 91,200	$ (7,600) 128,200	$ (7,900) 206,900
48) Oklahoma City	(5,650) 27,250	(6,650) 59,000	(7,000) 93,600	(7,300) 129,500	(7,300) 204,300
49) San Antonio	(5,380) 25,700	(6,360) 56,100	(7,060) 90,000	(7,500) 127,040	(7,500) 202,040
50) Tampa[4]	(5,170) 24,581	(6,486) 55,178	(7,191) 90,428	(7,191) 126,383	(7,191) 198,293

[1]Salary schedules were used that were in effect by Feb. 1, 1967.
[2]For the MA, the difference between the BA + 30 and BA + 60 was used as an equivalent.
[3]Incentive schedule (based on professional growth) used for computation since most teachers are on this schedule.
[4]It was assumed that all teachers passed requirements for the continuing contract and all teaching experience was in Florida.

Anyone using these figures should be careful in drawing conclusions about the rank of a particular school system. It could be argued that teachers do not advance lanes in the time periods as used here. Similarly, there may be some objection to the disregard for lanes beyond the master's-degree-plus-30-hours. Some researchers may wish to compute for 40 years instead of 30. Possible variations are endless. For the sake of defense, however, this author maintains that whatever method is used to describe earning power, the order would not be altered significantly from the one printed here.

INTRODUCTION part 2

Part two stems entirely from a questionnaire sent to the 50 largest cities and selected suburbs surrounding the 15 largest cities which enroll 6,000 pupils or more. A total of 180 suburban school systems were asked to co-operate in this survey and 147 responded. Since some of the data was unavailable in a few suburban school systems, and because of a few responses were incorrect, only 119 were used in the study. Of the school systems in the 50 largest cities, 46 provided most of the information requested. Only Dallas, San Antonio, Newark, and Tampa failed to respond to our questionnaire.

The reader will note that a few cities such as Oakland, Calif., and Fort Worth, Texas, are listed as "suburbs."

In order not to offend these school systems, it should be said that the school systems in these cities were only included because of their proximity to the largest cities. If there is a competition for teachers between the largest school systems and the school systems surrounding them, then a few of these larger cities have to be included.

The raw data for the chapters in part two are listed beginning on page 40. The school systems in the 15 largest school systems are listed by size of city. The suburbs are listed alphabetically below each large city. Note that a few of the large cities have suburban school systems in two states, but still within 30 miles of the large city. Statistics were used from county or parish school systems if their borders were within 30 miles of the big city school boundaries. The data for the 50 largest cities begins on page 51.

Several large cities do not have many suburban school systems near them that enroll 6,000 pupils or more. For instance, in Milwaukee the annexation of surrounding school systems has reduced the number of suburban school systems. Milwaukee more closely resembles a metropolitan school system.

Anyone wishing to analyze the individual data at the end of this section could surely make a number of other inferences that space and time do not permit us to do.

PLACEMENT OF NEW TEACHERS

In a response from 13 of the 15 largest cities and from 118 suburbs surrounding the 15 largest cities, three findings are noteworthy. First, the suburbs had to hire 19 percent of their teaching staffs new this year—the new teachers in the large cities represent only 12 percent of their total number of teachers. Second, of those new teachers hired during the 1966-1967 school year in the big cities, almost three out of four had *no* prior teaching experience. Less than half in the suburbs were inexperienced teachers. Third, the percentage of new teachers hired with a master's degree or higher is one and three-fourths times greater in the suburbs than in the large cities.

The following chart shows the relationship between each large city and its suburbs with weighted averages at the end of the chart.

PLACEMENT OF NEW TEACHERS[1]

Chicago and Philadelphia appear to hire an unusually high percentage of new teachers with no prior teaching experience. Houston hires slightly over half of its new teachers with no prior teaching experience, but only four percent with a master's degree.

In contrast, Los Angeles suburbs hire only one out of three new teachers with no prior teaching experience, and Boston suburbs hire one out of four new teachers with a master's degree or more.

City and Suburbs	New Teachers As a Percent Of Total Staff	Percent Of New Teachers With No Experience[2]	Percent Of New Teachers With Master's Degree Or Higher[2]
New York	7%	63%	%
Suburbs (N=14)	18	49	15
Chicago	14	83	3
Suburbs (N=14)	18	52	23
Los Angeles	14	69	10
Suburbs (N=23)	18	33	17 (N=20)
Philadelphia	16	94	7
Suburbs (N=4)	17	62	8
Detroit	7	73	11
Suburbs (N=17)	20	45 (N=12)	16
Baltimore	14	60	6
Suburbs (N=5)	20	60	8
Houston	15	51	4
Suburbs (N=2)	18	54	10 (N=1)
Cleveland	16	60	3
Suburbs (N=5)	23	47	15
Washington, D.C.	17	NA	NA
Suburbs (N=4)	25	43	15
St. Louis	9	75	9
Suburbs (N=5)	21	55	13
Milwaukee	11	60	NA
Suburbs (N=2)	26	53	7
San Francisco	11	39	50
Suburbs (N=10)	16	42 (N=9)	17
Boston	18	74	4
Suburbs (N=7)	15	40	25
Dallas	(did not respond to survey)		
Suburbs (N=3)	17	54	7
New Orleans	13	74	8
Suburbs (N=3)	21	42	7
Weighted Average Percentages			
15 Largest Cities (N=14)	12%	72%	8%(N=12)
Suburbs (N=118)	19	49	14

[1]N=Number of usable responses.

[2]It is possible that some of the teachers with no prior teaching experience have master's degrees, so do not assume that the two figures are mutually exclusive.

PLACEMENT OF ALL TEACHERS

Contrary to what many believe, that is, that most teachers are on the master's degree lane or the master's degree plus 30 additional semester hours lane, this study shows that, of the total teaching staff, most teachers are on the bachelor's lane.

Of the 50 largest cities, 34 of the 42 responding to the survey indicated that most of their teachers were on the bachelor's degree lane. The exceptions, those school systems having most of their teachers on a higher lane than the lowest bachelor's lane, are as follows:

School System	Single Lane Comprising Most Teachers
New York	MA or BA + 30
Los Angeles	BA + 84
San Francisco	BA + 30
San Diego	MA or BA + 36
Seattle	BA + 60
Phoenix	MA
Oakland	MA or BA + 30
Honolulu	Incentive 5 year schedule

Of the 116 suburbs responding to this question, 72 had most of their teachers on the bachelor's degree lane; 19 listed the master's degree lane. The remaining 25 answers were scattered between BA + 15 and MA + 57.

The difference between the large cities and the suburbs, while it may appear significant, is not—due to the

inclusion of the state of California. The data are misleading since the requirement for full certification in California is five years training, and a large part of this survey came from California. The reader should study the relationship between each large city and its suburbs for a more equitable comparison.

The reader should be careful, also, not to assume from this study that the majority of all teachers are on a particular lane. The question was phrased so that the respondent would list the *single lane* that included the most teachers. It is possible that the lane with the largest number of teachers is the bachelor's lane, and yet there may be a greater number of teachers in the combined MA lane and higher lanes.

It was evident from the distribution of teachers at various steps and lanes, and from attached reports, that a few school systems take real pride in hiring experienced, highly qualified teachers. Several school systems in California have reported that over the last several years, the number of teachers on the lower lanes has been considerably reduced.

Inexperienced teachers have to teach somewhere, and it is not suggested that they should not be hired. What is suggested is that, in school systems where 50 percent to 75 percent of the total teaching staff is on the bachelor's degree lane, or in school systems where 80 percent of the teachers have less than five years' experience, the students are being deprived of a first-rate education.

City and Suburbs	New Teachers	All Teachers
New York		8,900
Suburbs	6,362	8,228
Chicago	6,200	8,290
Suburbs	6,112	7,708
Los Angeles	6,761	9,078
Suburbs	6,597	8,052
Philadelphia	5,900	8,420
Suburbs	5,739	7,232
Detroit		8,296
Suburbs	6,314	7,920
Baltimore		7,562
Suburbs	5,947	7,208
Houston	5,000	6,109
Suburbs	5,346	6,163
Cleveland	5,725	7,000
Suburbs	5,692	7,391
Washington, D.C.		7,820
Suburbs	6,279	7,760
St. Louis	5,617	7,500
Suburbs	6,036	7,570
Milwaukee	6,500	7,558
Suburbs	5,943	7,258
San Francisco	6,865	10,033
Suburbs	6,769	9,176
Boston	5,750 (est.)	7,750
Suburbs	6,176	8,032
Dallas		
Suburbs	5,284	6,171
New Orleans	6,400	7,900
Suburbs	5,221	6,450

AVERAGE SALARIES OF NEW TEACHERS AND OF ALL TEACHERS 1966/67

The section "Placement of New Teachers" illustrated that the 15 largest cities hire a much higher percentage of new teachers with no prior teaching experience than do the suburbs that surround them. The suburbs also hire 6 percent more of their new teachers with a master's degree (or a higher lane) than do the 15 largest cities.

This section confirms that the average salary of the new teachers in the suburbs is slightly higher than in

TOTALS[1]

WEIGHTED[2] AVERAGE SALARIES FOR NEW TEACHERS

Large Cities	6,129 (N=10)
Suburbs	6,214 (N=112)

WEIGHTED[2] AVERAGE SALARIES FOR ALL TEACHERS

Large Cities	8,360 (N=14)
Suburbs	7,791 (N=96)

[1]N=number of usable responses

[2]For definition of "weighted," see footnote on p. 13.

the 15 largest cities. The average salary for the total teaching staff indicates, however, that the 15 largest cities pay an average of $569 more per teacher than is paid in the suburbs. What does this mean?

Is it possible that a teacher in the large cities has fewer steps to reach maximum salary than in the suburbs? Are the increments larger in the large cities than in the surrounding suburbs? Does the large city retain a higher percentage of its staff than the suburbs? Do the large cities have a higher percentage of teachers with 20, 30, or 40 years of teaching experience than the suburbs? Do the large city teachers have more advanced training, on the average, than teachers in the suburbs? The answers to these questions can be researched.

Why do the suburbs hire a larger percentage of new teachers with advanced training or longer teaching experience than the big cities? Why are the large cities hiring almost three out of four new teachers with no prior teaching experience? The answers to these questions may be determined also, but with, perhaps, less precision.

The motivation underlying hiring practices must depend to a large extent, upon the supply of teachers. All large school systems reject applicants for teaching positions. Many suburban school systems receive two to three times as many applications as there are positions to be filled. It would be interesting to study the credentials of applicants who have been rejected for employment, and correlate this with the reasons given for the decision not to hire.

In one suburban school system outside Chicago [Thornton Township High Schools] a total of 2,200 applications were received during the 1965-1966 school year for teaching positions. Ninety-seven were hired—only 4½ percent of all those who applied. A division by selected departmental areas shows the following:

Subject	Number of Applicants	Hired
English	324	15
Library	46	5
Physical Education		
Men	221	8
Women	28	4
Special Education	55	7
Foreign Language	184	8
Guidance	88	3

The respondent from this school system reported that there is a surplus of teachers but that some subject areas are critically short of highly qualified candidates. His suggestion was that students need to be informed early in college as to which fields are grossly oversupplied.

It would appear that in those school systems where there are considerably more applicants than available positions, the average salary for the new teachers would be high. In school systems where just enough applications are received to fill the need, and where they are forced to hire a larger percentage of inexperienced teachers, the average salary for new teachers would be less.

CREDIT FOR PRIOR TEACHING EXPERIENCE

From the 50 largest cities, a total of 46 responded to the question of how many salary schedule years are allowed for prior teaching experience when hiring new teachers. Almost half (22) allow a maximum of five or six years credit, and the range is from no year's experience allowed (Jersey City, N. J.) to full credit allowed (Houston, Boston, El Paso, Seattle, Honolulu, and New Orleans). The median for the 46 large cities is a maximum six years credit for prior classroom teaching.

The suburbs that surround the 15 largest cities have a similar distribution with a median of six years. Thirty-eight responses were in the five- and six-year categories.

The range for the suburbs was from three years credit (3) to full credit (14).

Teachers who move from one school system to another generally do so within their first five years of teaching. As can be seen from the date above, the median from this sample (154 systems including the large cities and the suburbs) is six years maximum credit given for outside teaching experience. Many teachers would be reluctant to move to another school system if a cut in pay would result. Some teachers can still earn more in another school system even if their total teaching experience were not granted, but this is still discrimination toward the outside teachers.

The sad part of it is that many teachers must move. Husbands may have to locate in another state or another part of the same state. Reasons of health cause some to move to better climates. Women will often return to the teaching profession after raising families, and they may by then be far from their former school systems. Some teachers simply want to better themselves. Whatever the reason, it does not seem appropriate to penalize those with years of teaching experience and training. Supposedly, those teachers would be most in demand if the profession was genuinely trying to upgrade the teaching staffs.

Reciprocity for granting prior teaching credit among the states and among school systems has been discussed and re-discussed. It is this author's contention that this archaic and demeaning limitation on transferable experience should be abolished immediately. To say to a professional teacher that his teaching experience above five or six years is detrimental to another school system, or that it is not comparable to another teacher's, is absurd.

TEACHERS AT MAXIMUM

In the 15 largest cities (14 responding), 28 percent of all teachers are at the maximum step of the combined lanes on the regular salary schedules. For the 50 largest cities, (42 responding to this question) there are 27 percent at maximum. For the 103 suburban school systems responding to this question, 26 percent of all teachers are at maximum.

The major factor for the slight differences above is the growth of the smaller school systems. It was determined in the chapter on "Placement of New Teachers" that the suburban school systems hired 19 percent of their teachers new this year. The new teachers in the 15 largest cities represent 12 percent of all teachers. It may be that the teaching faculties in the suburbs have fewer years of teaching experience, on the average, than the large cities.

The percentage of teachers at maximum is *one* indication of the ability of a school system to keep its teachers. If 50 percent of the teachers have remained in the system long enough to reach maximum, it almost follows that the school system has been a good place to teach. It also follows that if the teacher turnover rate is high, the percentage of teachers at maximum will remain around 5 or 10 percent.

LONG-TERM SUBSTITUTES

Some of the big city school systems in the United States employ a large percentage of their total teaching staff as long-term substitutes, or "permanent substitutes" as they are frequently called. The term long-term substitute, as used in this study, is defined as a teacher who: (1) regularly teaches in the same school system throughout a semester or school year, generally at the same station, and (2) does not possess a valid teaching certificate, or has not passed a local school system examination.

The teacher may have a teaching certificate issued by one of the states, but the particular school system may

have additional requirements. A teaching certificate in one state may not meet all the requirements for another state. Furthermore, some school systems (such as Chicago) have a separate examination that must be passed in order for a teacher to be placed on the regular teacher's schedule. A few of the Southern states require that all teachers pass the National Teachers Examination.

There also exists a small percentage of full-time teachers who lack enough credits in their teaching fields to be fully certified. A few have completed course work for graduation but do not meet other graduation requirements. Many liberal arts graduates have not had practice teaching (as it is called in many states), i.e., the observation and actual teaching of students under the direction of a supervising teacher. Finally, many prospective teachers have dropped out of college at some point. How many of these teachers are employed as full-time substitutes, and where are they?

The United States Office of Education reports there were 90,500 full-time classroom teachers that had substandard certificates in the fall of 1966.[1] That number may be small when measured against the 23,464 operating school districts, but it *is* significant in two ways: (1) the number of classroom teachers holding substandard certificates had remained near 82,000 for the four years prior to 1966, and (2) it appears that large numbers of these teachers are concentrated in a relatively few large cities.

In this study an attempt was made to determine what percentage of the total teaching staff was comprised of long-term substitutes. In order to concentrate on those systems having the most significant numbers of long-term substitutes, an arbitrary figure of 5 percent or more was used to categorize those school systems which had large numbers of long-term substitutes. Of the 50 largest school systems, those which rank in the 5 percent or more classification are as follows:

[1]United States Office of Education press release, Jan. 29, 1967.

School System	Number of long-term substitutes	Percent of classroom teachers
New York City	18,400	34
Chicago	5,249	25
Los Angeles	2,145[1]	10
Philadelphia	1,295	13
Detroit	781	8
Baltimore	2,088	29
Washington, D.C.	2,031	34
St. Louis	422	10
San Francisco	331	9
Boston	284	7
Pittsburgh	166	6
Seattle	344	10
Buffalo	902	28
Cincinnati	193	6
Jersey City	117	8

[1]Not classified as long-term substitutes—these are teachers who have not passed the local examination and who are on limited assignments.

The findings indicate that, generally, the larger the school system the more long-term substitutes employed. The survey revealed that long-term substitutes represent 13 percent of the total teaching staff in the 15 largest cities (excluding Dallas, which did not respond). The suburbs surrounding the 15 largest cities employ fewer than 1 percent long-term substitutes.

Only 5.1 percent of all the teachers in the United States hold substandard certificates.[2] The long-term substitute cannot be construed necessarily as a teacher with a substandard certificate, although a sizable number of the long-term substitutes are certainly in this category.

[2]*Ibid.*

Why do some school systems utilize large numbers of long-term substitutes and others use so few? Salary is not the answer. New York City pays its teachers relatively well and yet it has a high percentage of long-term substitutes. Other school systems pay very low salaries and have only a negligible number of long-term substitutes. Cause and effect is very difficult to determine.

It can be safely said that the examination given by a local school system prevents many teachers from being placed on the regular teacher's salary schedule. It is important to say here that some school systems may pay a teacher on the regular salary schedule and still classify the teacher as "conditional," "probationary," "temporary," or some other term to indicate that the teacher has not yet passed a written examination. This inconsistency in methods by which school systems classify their employees has a bearing on the validity of this study.

One might conjecture that school systems that hire large numbers of long-term substitutes also have poor working conditions, such as large class sizes, decrepit and condemned buildings, inadequate fringe benefits, or a high rate of student assaults upon teachers. Whether this applies to such cities as New York, Chicago, Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Buffalo is a matter that needs further research.

In contrast, the argument can be made that boards of education may deliberately hire long-term substitutes to keep the total cost of salaries down to a minimum. The maximum pay level for substitutes is usually lim-

ited to five or six steps of the basic salary schedule for all teachers; thus considerable "savings" can result by hiring more substitutes. Whether this occurs intentionally or not is mere speculation.

Whichever analysis is accepted, the hiring of long-term substitutes remains a separate and enormous problem for some of the larger school systems, and the need to provide these teachers with equitable salaries and auxiliary benefits is also a pressing problem.

Paying the long-term substitute

Most school systems still pay long-term substitutes on a per diem basis. Some school systems have a separate salary schedule for substitutes, which is below the salaries paid to regular teachers. Other school systems place substitutes on the regular teacher's salary schedule but limit the number of steps to five or six. A few pay the long-term substitute on a par with regular teachers with similar training and experience.

It would appear that boards of education should pay all classroom teachers equally for the job that is being performed. There is no evidence to prove that substitutes are any less effective than a regular teacher, and certainly they are hired to perform the same work. Since there is always some doubt concerning the reliability of examinations (and oral interviews) and the sensibleness of accreditation requirements, each employed teacher should be allowed to keep his self-respect by being on a par with others doing the same kind of work.

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers—Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
NEW YORK CITY	54,200	2,564	4,064[1]		8	$	$8,900	BA+30 or MA	23%	34%
East Orange, N.J.	529	68	123	9	8	6,020	7,638	BA	18	0
Farmingdale, N.Y.	735	63	120	15	full	6,318	8,629	BA	11	0
Great Neck, N.Y.	598	11	77	30	8	7,719	9,939	MA	48	
Linden, N.J.	393	30	51	2	8	5,843		BA		
Montclair, N.J.	385	21	84	14	full	6,452	8,154	BA	24	0
New Rochelle, N.Y.	616	12	124	39	9	8,000	9,000	MA	24	0
Passaic, N.J.	368	39	68	6	10	5,850	6,280	BA	24	0
Paterson, N.J.	950	75	130	20	4	6,000	7,800	BA		
Perth Amboy, N.J.	295	39	57	1	full	5,710	8,099	BA+	10	
Port Washington, N.Y.	378	36	73	11	6	6,620		BA	29	0
Union City, N.J.	356	44	65	3		5,000		BA+15	37	1
White Plains, N.Y.	502	23	74	20	10	7,200	9,580	MA		1-2
Woodbridge, N.J.	843	92	148	10	10	5,725	7,075		25	0
Yonkers, N.Y.	1,364	186	325	50	7	6,300		BA+30 or MA	19	0
Suburban Totals:	8,312	739	1,519	230		$6,362[4]	$8,228[4]			
Average Percentages:		49%[1]	18%[2]	15%[3]					24%[5]	

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
CHICAGO	20,997	2,500	3,000	100	5	$6,200	$8,290	BA	6%[1]	25%
Aurora (East)	350	46	88	10		6,064	7,179	BA	51	1
Blue Island Elem.	136	14	23	3	10	5,865	6,677	BA	19	0
Community High Schools (Villa Park)	357	32	101	44	8	6,645	8,729	MA	20	0
E. Maine (Niles) Elem.	305	44	131	20	6	5,250			43	0
Elgin	900	92	200	21	5	6,300	6,800	BA	7	.5
Elmhurst #46 Elem.	302	34	68	1	6	5,700	6,922	BA	9	0
Evanston Elem.	615	52	127	29	10			BA	11	0
Gary, Ind.	1,867	125	37	10	8 and 10	6,140			20	1.44
Maine Twp. H.S.	480	47	112	51	9	6,527	8,905	MA	17	0
Maywood, Melrose, Broadview Elem.	229	14	41	3	7	5,882		BA	8	0
Morton of Cicero H.S.	409	13		26	7	6,700		BA		4
Niles H.S.	428	26	71	31	8	6,771	8,800	MA	12	0
Palatine Elem.	426	87	138	3	5	5,400	6,373	BA		0
Proviso H.S.	358	19	54	14	7	6,126	9,184	MA	12	0
Thornton H.S. (Harvey)	359	34	95	54	9	6,859	7,743	BA+15	17	0
Suburban Totals:	7,521	679	1,286	320		$6,112[4]	$7,708[4]			
Average Percentages:		52%[1]	18%[2]	23%[3]					19%[5]	

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers-- Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
LOS ANGELES Unif.	21,881	2,074	3,006	287	6	$6,761	$9,078	BA+84	34%	10%
Anaheim Elem.	466	62	90	3	4	6,179	7,267	BA		0
Burbank	578	28	70	12	6	6,863	9,323	BA+28		−1
Compton Elem.	551	44	123	17	4	6,505	8,400	BA	20	0
Corona U.H.S.	433	34	130	15	5	6,445	7,225	BA	17	0
Culver City Unif.	290	10	45	8	5	7,560	9,473	MA	53	1.7
El Monte H.S.	261	21	34	4	6	6,533		MA	18	0
Glendora Unif.	326	26	51	3	5	6,196	9,785	BA+20	24	1
Inglewood Unif.	462	33	108	40	6	6,876	8,711	MA+30	27	.3
Lancaster Elem.	245	13	43	2	3	5,954	7,882	BA	13	0
Lynwood Unif.	234	22	42	1	3	6,306	8,653	BA	50	
Newport-Mesa Unif.	1,020	38	158	56	6	6,800	8,235	BA	12	
Ontario-Montclair	573	34	99	12	5	5,935	6,448	BA+	21	.05
Orange Unif.	870	44	175			6,990	7,994	BA+30 or MA	12	0
Oxnard U.H.S.	472	31	85		4	7,238	9,084	MA+30	18	0
Oxnard Elem.	300	15	68	7	5	6,721	7,907	BA		0
Pasadena Unif.	1,310	85	187	33	4	6,767	8,817	MA or BA+36	20	−1
Redondo Beach Elem.	352	31	67	10	4	5,907	7,200	BA+18	25	0
Riverside Unif.	915	47	140	32	5	6,409	8,435	MA+30	44	0
San Bernardino Unif.	1,131	16	121	11	5	6,690		MA+30	40	0
Santa Ana Unif.	880	72	225	33	4	6,500	7,900	BA	35	.25
Santa Monica Unif.	663	36	125		5	6,000	9,515	MA+56	35	.4347

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
Torrence U.	1,219	86	210	26	4	$6,668	$8,089	BA+30 or MA	4	—1
Ventura U.	756	13	125	28	5	7,004	9,340	MA	62	1
Suburban Totals:	14,816	841	2,521	353		$6,597[4]	$8,052[4]			
Average Percentages:		33%[1]	18%[2]	17%[3]					28%[5]	
PHILADELPHIA	9,965	1,514	1,600	115	7	$5,900	$8,420	BA	42%	13%
Bristol Twp., Pa.	507	35	72	7	8	5,700	7,654	BA	38	—1
Camden, N.J.	790	127	162	5	full	5,433	6,600	BA	46	1
Trenton, N.J.	799	51	114	6	6	6,100		BA	0	1
Upper Darby, Pa.	501	65	103	17	full	5,850	7,800	BA	27	3
Suburban Totals:	2,597	278	451	35		$5,739[4]	$7,232[4]			
Average Percentages:		62%[1]	17%[2]	8%[3]					28%[5]	
DETROIT	9,800	528	721	76	4	$	$8,296		42%	7.97%
Allen Park	291	34	59	2	4	5,850	7,450	BA		0
Dearborn	1,150		125	40	4	6,500	9,000	MA	38	.3
Ferndale	368		88	8	10		7,921	BA	36	—1
Garden City	546	56	120	20	10	6,400	7,500	BA	25	0
Grosse Pointe	573	27	109	30	10	7,000		BA	18	1.5

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
Hazel Park	330		67	5	5			BA	43	.7
Highland Park	497	37	91	25	6	$6,100	$8,150	BA		−1
Lincoln Park	436		102	28	5	5,700	7,306	BA+15	48	4
Livonia	1,450		407	73						−1
Mt. Clemens	270	11	39	4	6	6,123	7,723	BA	45	0
Plymouth	312	34	75	11		6,003	7,707	BA	24	.0006
Roseville	521	30	51	3	5	5,823	7,907	BA+	31	2.88
Royal Oak	834	67	144	16	5	6,217	7,800	BA	36	1
Van Dyke	300	21	39	4	5	6,427	8,204	BA	45	0
Warren	936	112	248	20	5	6,313	7,516	BA	3	.0075
Waterford Twp.	673	57	139	15	7	6,854	7,394	BA	21	0
Wayne	802	69	124	16	10	6,265	8,107	BA	28	−1
Suburban Totals:	10,289	555	2,027	320		$6,314[4]	$7,920[4]			
Average Percentages:		45%[1]	20%[2]	16%[3]					32%[5]	
BALTIMORE	7,276	618	1,035	58	11	$	$7,562		26	28.7
Anne Arundel Co.	2,652	368	532	45	full			BA	20	5.2
Baltimore Co.	5,183	591	941	75	10	5,938	7,349	BA	18	−1
Carroll Co.	558	51	110	2	14	5,000	5,900	BA	25	0
Hartford Co.	1,037	136	260	21	10	5,650		BA	17	0

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
Howard Co.	542	55	152	14	15	$7,200		BA+34		0
Suburban Totals:	9,972	1,201	1,995	157		$5,947[4]	$7,208[4]			
Average Percentages:		60%[1]	20%[2]	8%[3]					20%[5]	
HOUSTON	9,242	709	1,400	50	full	$5,000	$6,109	BA	25%	−1%
Galena Park	542	31	59	6	full	5,221	6,080	BA	25	
Pasedena	1,309	147	268		full	5,374	6,197	BA	31	0
Suburban Totals:	1,851	178	327	6		$5,346[4]	$6,163[4]			
Average Percentages:		54%[1]	18%[2]	10%[3]					28%[5]	
CLEVELAND	5,818	558	933	26	5	$5,725	$7,000	BA	15%	1.75%
Berea	654	85	168	10	5	6,200		BA	6	0
Cleveland Hts.	634	49	122	57	10		7,898	BA	32	0
Euclid	506	53	101	7	5	5,663	7,308	BA	21	0
Lakewood	410	50	112	13	10	5,469	7,180	BA	12	3.4
S. Euclid, Lyndhurst	385	46	101	4	7½	5,124	6,891	BA	10	0
Suburban Totals:	2,589	283	604	91		$5,692[4]	$7,391[4]			
Average Percentages:		47%[1]	23%[2]	15%[3]					16%[5]	

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
WASHINGTON, D.C.	5,921		1,032		9		$7,820	BA	17%	34.3%
Alexandria City, Va.	862	63	175	25	10	$6,200	7,249	BA	28%	0%
Fairfax Co., Va.	4,134	414	1,103	164	10	6,300	7,600	BA	1	
Montgomery Co., Md.	4,381	416	899	159	9	6,400	8,090	BA	25	0
Prince Georges Co., Md.	5,500	673	1,500	200	9	6,200	7,453	BA	13	−1
Suburban Totals:	14,877	1,566	3,677	548		$6,279[4]	$7,670[4]			
Average Percentages:		43%[1]	25%[2]	15%[3]					17%[5]	
ST. LOUIS	4,222	296	395	35	5	$5,617	$7,500	BA	14%	10%
Cahokia, Ill.	368	48	86	6	14	5,950	6,875	BA		1
E. St. Louis, Ill.	850	86	154	26	6	6,500	7,650	BA		0
Ferguson-Florissant, Mo.	621	119	173	9	5	5,646		BA	15	0
Granite City, Ill.	588	45	90	7	3	5,948	7,499	BA	33	.17
University City, Mo.	402	27	84	27	5-10	6,170	8,140	MA	15	−.05
Suburban Totals:	2,829	325	587	75		$6,036[4]	$7,570[4]			
Average Percentages:		55%[1]	21%[2]	13%[3]					21%[5]	

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers—Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Subatitutes
MILWAUKEE	4,579	300	500			$6,500	$7,558	BA	43%	1.5%
Menomonee Falls	321	49	96	6		5,833	6,650	BA	3	0
West Allis-West Milwaukee	587	76	140	10	5	6,019	7,591	BA	33	−1
Suburban Totals:	908	125	236	16		$5,943[4]	$7,258[4]			
Average Percentages:		53%[1]	26%[2]	7%[3]					18%[5]	
SAN FRANCISCO	3,682	156	400	201	5	$6,865	$10,003	BA+30	36%	9%
Alameda City Unif.	436	24	73	5	5	6,679	9,222	MA+30	27	1.14
Berkeley City Unif.	675	64	248	51	5	6,080	8,853	BA+72 or MA+24	19	0
Hayward Unif.	1,095	88	204	27	5	6,643		AB+60	29	0
Oakland City Unif.	2,652	158	246	19	7	7,359	9,185	BA+30 or MA	42	1
Richmond Unif.	1,658	150	250	43	5	6,000	8,741	AB+72 or MA+57	39	.1
San Leandro Unif.	444	12	71	14	7	7,152	9,212	BA+60 or MA+15	37	0
San Mateo Elem.	544	24	100	18	5	6,969	9,177	BA+60		0
San Mateo U.H.S.	503	22	70	38	11	8,773	11,004	AB+75	41	0
San Rafael Elem.	354	13	55	14	7	7,429	9,628	BA+60	26	0

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
S. San Francisco Unif.	460		95	10	4	7,055	8,747	AB+30	19	0
Suburban Totals:	8,821	555	1,412	239		$6,769[4]	$9,176[4]			
Average Percentages:		42%[1]	16%[2]	17%[3]					30%[5]	
BOSTON	4,365	786	578	28	full	$5,500-6,000	$7,750		45%	6.5%
Brookline	394	17	87	40	full	7,512	8,219	MA	44	0
Cambridge	554	27	52	9	5	5,990	8,271	BA	42	0
Malden	435	44	67	7	11	5,400	7,300	BA	39	0
Melrose	316	27	72	16	full	5,800	7,500	BA+14	52	0
Needham	353	15	65	26	11	6,448	8,458	AB	48	
Somerville	662	50	70	3		5,200	5,525	BA	41	1.5
Wellesley	353	10	59	16	10	6,568	8,400	BA or MA	42	0
Suburban Totals:	3,067	190	472	117		$6,176[4]	$8,032[4]			
Average Percentages:		40%[1]	15%[2]	25%[3]					44%[5]	

MAJOR CITIES AND THEIR SUBURBS continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
DALLAS										
Arlington	622	63	119	3	full	$5,300	$5,900	BA		0%
Ft. Worth	2,290	263	451	30		5,337	6,331	BA	25	0
Mesquite	522	61	141	20	full	5,100	5,600	BA	20	0
Suburban Totals:	4,064	387	711	53		$5,284[4]	$6,171[4]			
Average Percentages:		54%[1]	17%[2]	7%[3]					23%[5]	
NEW ORLEANS	4,221	418	568	48	full	$6,400	$7,900	BA	38%	3%
Livingston Parish	387	32	84	5	full	5,000		BA	35	
St. Bernard Parish	477	35	95	9		5,500	6,450	BA	22	0
St. Charles Parish	312	35	65	3	full	5,100		BA	7	1
Suburban Totals:	1,176	102	244	17		$5,221[4]	$6,450[4]			
Average Percentages:		42%[1]	21%[2]	7%[3]					21%[5]	
Totals:										
15 Largest Cities:	166,169	13,021	19,232	1,024		$6,129[4]	$8,360[4]			
Percentages:		72%[1]	12%[2]	8%[3]					28%[5]	13%[6]
Suburbs:	93,689	8,004	18,069	2,577		$6,214[4]	$7,791[4]			
Percentages:		49%[1]	19%[2]	14%[3]					26%[5]	

Footnotes

[1]Percentage of new teachers hired with no prior teaching experience.
[2]Percentage of total teaching staff that are new teachers.
[3]Percentage of new teachers hired with a master's degree or higher.
[4]Average salaries are weighted—for definition, see footnote on page 13.
[5]Average percent of all teachers who are at maximum steps.
[6]Average percent of all teachers who are long-term substitutes in the 15 largest cities.

SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE 50 LARGEST CITIES (Listed by Population Size of City)

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
New York	54,200	2,564	4,064[1]		8	$	$8,900	BA+30 or MA	23%	33%
Chicago	20,997	2,500	3,000	100	5	6,200	8,290	BA	6	25
Los Angeles	21,881	2,074	3,006	287	6	6,761	9,078	BA+84	22	10
Philadelphia	9,965	1,514	1,600	115	7	5,900	8,420	BA	42	13
Detroit	9,800	528	721	76	4		8,296		42	7.97
Baltimore	7,276	618	1,035	58	11		7,562		26	28.7
Houston	9,242	709	1,400	50	full	5,000	6,109	BA	25	—1
Cleveland	5,818	558	933	26	5	5,725	7,000	BA	15	1.75
Washington, D.C.	5,921		1.032		9		7,820	BA	17[2]	34.3
St. Louis	4,222	296	395	35	5	5,617	7,500	BA	14	10
Milwaukee	4,579	300	500		5	6,500	7,558	BA	47	1.5
San Francisco	3,682	156	400	201	5	6,865	10,033	BA+30	35	9
Boston	4,365	786	578	28	full	5,750	7,750		46	6.5
Dallas	no response									
New Orleans	4,221	418	568	48	full	6,400	7,900	BA	38	3
Pittsburgh	2,763				7		7,850	BA		6
San Antonio	no response									
San Diego	4,671	265	626	27	6	7,019	9,167	MA or BA+36	38	0
Seattle	3,620	286	507	73	full	6,068	7,997	BA+60	41	9.5

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
Buffalo	3,221	284	348	30	6	$5,678	$7,458	BA	15%	28%
Cincinnati	3,164	303	463		5		7,056	BA	31	6.1
Memphis	4,602	275	502	28	5	5,164	6,156	BA	20	0
Denver	3,909	335	670	69	5	5,525		BA	32	4
Atlanta	4,307	519	782	41	3	5,238	6,383	BA	10	.7
Minneapolis	2,667	286	473	68	6	5,900	7,855	BA	39	3.7
Indianapolis	4,161	201	491	131	15	6,332	7,932	BA	24	0
Kansas City	956	123	215	11	6		6,084	BA	7	0
Columbus	3,851	447	717	53	5	5,700		BA	22	
Phoenix	989	55	132	67	4	6,175	8,513	MA	24	0
Newark	no response									
Louisville	2,158	187	231	10	8		7,011	BA		0
Portland	3,204	229	548		8-9	5,993	7,616	BA	41	2.5
Oakland	2,652	158	246	19	7	7,359	9,185	BA+30 or MA	42	
Fort Worth	2,920	263	451	30	7½	5,337	6,331	BA	25	0
Long Beach	2,835	135	296	95	5	6,822	8,863	BA	28	−1
Birmingham	2,471	223	445	25	3		6,180	BA	45	
Oklahoma City	2,627	259	514	62	7	5,426			3	0
Rochester	1,837	165	403	69	10	7,000	8,588	BA	11	3

SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE 50 LARGEST CITIES continued

SCHOOL SYSTEM	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number of New Teachers —No Experience	Total Number of New Teachers	Number of New Teachers— Master's Degree or Higher	Years Credit for Prior Teaching Experience	Average Salary of New Teachers	Average Salary of All Teachers	Lane Most Teachers Are On	Percent of Teachers at Maximum	Percent of Long-term Substitutes
Toledo	2,269	213	365		6	$	$6,596	BA	%	1.05%
St. Paul	1,865	170	282		8	5,992	7,752	BA	48[2]	0
Norfolk	2,389	234	446	28	9	5,277	6,386	BA	36	.0033
Omaha	2,140	282	427	29	5	5,300		BA	17	1
Honolulu	6,413	1,000	1,483	175	full	5,885	7,683	incentive schedule 5 years	24	.0
Miami	8,537	476	850	66	6	5,700	7,246	BA	28	0
Akron	2,220	147	313	17	5	6,100	7,133	BA	17	0
El Paso	2,656	157	430	45	full	5,345	6,135	BA	20	0
Jersey City	1,466	194	223	7	0	5,595	7,550	BA		8
Tampa	no response									
Dayton	2,475	131	329	32	6	6,111	7,900	BA	36	.007
Tulsa	2.941	238	570	64	6	5,336	6,557	BA	30	0
Totals:	264,535	21,261	34,010	2,395						
Averages:	(n=46)[8]	(n=44)[8]	(n=45)[8]	(n=38)[8]		$5,976[6]	$8,024[6]			
Percentages:		64%[3]	13%[4]	9%[5]		(n=36)[8]	(n=42)[8]		27%[7] (n=42)[8]	

Footnotes

[1]Approximation, does not include teachers returning from leaves of absence.
[2]Percentages apply to total staff.
[3]Percentage of new teachers hired with no prior teaching experience.
[4]Percentage of total teaching staff that are new teachers.
[5]Percentage of new teachers hired with a master's degree or higher.
[6]Average salaries are weighted--for definition, see footnote on page 13.
[7]Average percent of all teachers who are at maximum steps.
[8]N=number of usable responses

Some Other Publications From the AFT Research Effort:

MIMEOGRAPHED MONOGRAPHS

A NEW TENURE ACT BY MARY LEE LEAHY. This act streamlines existing tenure legislation, eliminates the mockery of a school board hearing, and introduces numerous other innovations. By a young woman lawyer from Chicago. (Publication No. M-1, 35¢ a copy.)

CREDENTIAL REFORM IN CALIFORNIA by Ralph Schloming. The fascinating fable of the Fisher Act in California. The good guys versus the bad guys. The academicians take on the educationists and win! (Publication No. M-2, 35¢ a copy.)

HOUSE RESEARCH

SURVEY OF TEACHERS' SALARIES, September, 1966. A comprehensive survey of teachers' salaries in nearly 900 school systems with enrollment of 6,000 students or more. (Publication No. 85, $1.50 to non-members, 50¢ to members.)

TEACHERS' WELFARE PACKAGE. March, 1966 A thorough survey of sick leave, severance pay, sabbatical leave, duty-free lunch period, teacher aids, and other such items in over 400 school districts. (Publication No. 66, 50¢ to non-members, 25¢ to members.).

THE USES OF TEACHER POWER. An examination of teacher tactics—including strikes, sanctions, and mass resignations—used to improve school conditions. Charts listing all teacher strikes in United States. (Publication No. 184, 50¢ a copy, $20 per 100.)

THREE CHARACTERS IN SEARCH OF A BUILDING REPRESENTATIVE HANDBOOK. No set answers. Three AFT leaders discuss what should go into a manual for union stewards and, in so doing, reveal conflicting philosophies as well as agreed-upon techniques. Chapter organization, membership recruitment, grievance representation. (Publication No. 10, 10¢ a copy, $2.00 for 25, $5.00 for 100.)

GRASS ROOTS RESEARCH

ICONOCLAST IN THE CLASSROOM, Essays by Conner Reed. Twelve informal essays on such subjects as "teacher pedantry," "faculty committees," "beefing up the curriculum," and "sanctions" by a veteran Seattle classroom teacher. (Publication No. G-1, 50¢ a copy, $10 a hundred.)

THE EXPERIENCE OF FREEDOM: Censorship and the Teacher by Kingsley Widmer. A polemic on teacher, administrator, and textbook censorship by a professor at San Diego State College. (Publication No. G-2, 50¢ a copy, $10 a hundred.)

SOME IMPLICATIONS FROM A STUDY OF INCARCERATED DROPOUTS by Nelson Burke and Dr. Alfred Simons. Some personal observations on the track system and I.Q. testing by two Washington, D.C., activists. Prompted by an experimental project with dropouts in a correctional institution. (Publication No. G-3, 50¢ a copy, $10 per hundred).

CURRICULAR VIEWPOINTS

THE NEGRO IN MODERN AMERICAN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS by Irving Sloan. Scarsdale junior high school teacher reviews the portrayal of the Negro in 13 of the most recent junior and senior high history textbooks. (Publication No. V-1, $1.00 a copy, $10.00 for 25.)

CREATIVITY AND THE TEACHER by Frances Kornbluth and Bernard Bard. Those who teach by pain are scored while those who teach by releasing the student's imagination are praised. Many examples drawn from kindergarten through primary grades. (Publication No. V-2, $1.00 a copy, $10.00 for 25.)

REAL NEGROES/HONEST SETTINGS by Dharathula H. Millender. An annotated bibliography of children's and young people's books about Negro life and history. 83 books recommended. Millender is librarian, Gary public schools. (Publication No. V-3, $1.00 a copy, $10.00 for 25.)

For Additional Copies
Write to

AFT **THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS** AFL-CIO

716 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Please mention item No. 90
$1 for single copy
$4 for 5 copies
$12.50 for 25 copies